UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,289	03/26/2007	Andrew Charlton Clothier	424662013300	2200
	7590 03/24/201 FOERSTER LLP	EXAMINER		
1650 TYSONS SUITE 400	BOULEVARD	PAUL, ANTONY M		
MCLEAN, VA	22102	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2837	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/24/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/588,289	CLOTHIER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
ANTONY M. PAUL	2837	

	ANTONY M. PAUL	2837	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07.	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE (f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	**	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: <u>11,12,28 and 29</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 thru 5, 8, 9, 10, 13 thru 16, 18, 19, 2</u>	<u>0, 30 and 31</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10.	on of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. ☑ Other: <u>Examiner's comments</u> .			
	/BENTSU RO/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 2837	

EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicants' argue that Yamamoto do not disclose applying a single angle correction factor to a portion of a predetermined advance angle profile covering a range of different rotor speeds. After understanding of the applicants' disclosure, prior art(s) teaching, the final office action dated 12/09/09 and applicants' remarks dated 03/09/10, the arguments presented by the applicants' are not persuasive.

Applicants' fig. 9 shows advance angle correction (for example 2.1) associated with a voltage (207 V). The advance angles are shown varied for respective voltages shown.

Yamamoto shows in fig. 5 advance angle control map 191 included in a controller IC 173 (fig.4) and a single correction factor read on to for example, the advance angle of 2.1 (which is defined as the degree of the phase angle to be corrected, see [0021] of Yamamoto), which is applied to a predetermined portion of the advance angle control map 191. The advance angle of Yamamoto is a correction advance angle as it is used as the degree of the phase angle to be corrected. Similar to applicants' fig. 9, the advance angle correction is associated with a voltage, for example, the single advance angle correction factor of 2.1 corresponds to voltage range of 10 to 10.5V (and/ current of 1-3 A) and therefore covering a range of rotor speeds are obvious in that the speed range is based upon the voltage and/ current applied to the motor.

Moreover Ookawa teaches covering a range of rotor speeds as fig. 19 shows advance angle correction covering a range of speeds of the motor (fig.18). Therefore Yamamoto in view of Ookawa teaches the argued limitations of claim 1 and claims 1-5, 8, 18, 19, 20, 30 stand rejected. Claims 9, 10, 13-16 and 31 are taught by Yamamoto in view of Kaplan et al.

Applicants' further argue that the controller does not apply a correction factor to any of the values stored by the map, nor is a correction factor produced for any of the values stored by the map. Instead, the controller of Yamamoto selects from the map an advance angle that corresponds to batteryvoltage and current. After selecting an advance angle, the controller does not then correct the selected angle.

The above argument does not read on to the claim language for claims 1 and 9.